REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated April 27, 2006. Applicant requests a two month extension of time to reply. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-17 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, and 6-17. Applicants cancel claims 14 and 15 without prejudice to filing one or more claims having similar subject matter. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, and 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In the previously filed Amendment and Reply, Applicants amended claim 1 to clarify that product data is retrieved from a plurality of website domains. In response, the Examiner asserts that, "[n]owhere does the specification as originally filed disclose retrieving and providing product data from a plurality of 'website domains'" (page 2, paragraph 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The specification makes frequent reference to Uniform Resource Locators (URL) in describing the process of retrieving product data from other merchant and/or supplier web sites. For example, paragraph 43 states, "in block 810, the identity of the source of the product feed (e.g., merchant or supplier) is found from the product feed itself or from the address from which it was received (e.g. a URL for the supplier website)." Those of ordinary skill in the art would immediately appreciate that a "domain" is an inherent element of a URL. According to the Britannica Encyclopedia Online (http://www.britannica.com/ebc/article-9381628?query=URL&ct=), a URL is defined as follows:

> "The address contains three elements: the type of protocol used to access the file (e.g., HTTP for a Web page, ftp for an FTP site); the domain name or IP address of the server where the file resides; and, optionally, the pathname to the file (i.e., description of the file's location)" (emphasis added).

As such, Applicants assert that the specification provides adequate disclosure of "website domains", therefore claims 1, 3-4, 6-13, and 16-17 are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph because a website domain is an inherent element of a URL.

The Examiner rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a claim covering every conceivable means for achieving the recited method as set forth in any of claims 1-13. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants cancel claims 14 and 15.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants cancel claims 14 and 15.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, and 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagasaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,353 ("Yagasaki") in view of Musgrove et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,725,222 ("Musgrove"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Yagasaki generally discloses a system for categorizing various products into a searchable database, whereby online users may locate and purchase desired products. Specifically, the Yagasaki system is limited to a mall server that classifies products into a number of categories. Each category is accompanied with an effective period which determines when each product is available for search. For example, if a product is classified as "Halloween", then a "Halloween" category may only appear within a dropdown menu selector between the dates of September 1 through October 31. As a result, customers interacting with the Yagasaki system will only be able to search for products where the search date falls within the defined effective period for the product category. Such a system is described as resulting in a more authentic "mall-like" experience, wherein various product categories are only made available to shoppers during specific periods during the year.

In supporting the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner relies on Yagasaki as disclosing the step of adding a categorized data element to a buffer table when the category does not exist and then integrating the categorized data element with stored product data within a product table when a corresponding category later exists. Specifically, the Examiner has directed Applicants to Figure 9 of Yagasaki as disclosing this step.

Figure 9 of Yagasaki is a flowchart demonstrating the process for generating a search screen. As described above, the Yagasaki system enables customers to search for products where the search date falls within the defined effective period for the product category. To construct a search page, an HTML document template is created where a store name dropdown menu is pre-populated with a list of available store names and a category dropdown menu is blank. The Yagasaki system then determines the current date, according to the systems internal calendar. The system then accesses a master category table which lists each defined category with a corresponding start date and end date.

Therefore, a single record of the master category table may include the following three fields, for example:

Category Name	Start Date	End Date
Thanksgiving	10/15/06	11/23/06

The Yagasaki system then begins to process each entry category consecutively to determine if the current date falls between, or includes, the start date and the end date. If the date falls within the start and end date, then the category name is added to the category dropdown menu list. This process is repeated until the final record is in the master category table. Regardless of whether or not a category in the master category table is added to the category dropdown list, the data remains in the table and is not otherwise altered in any way. Significantly, the data is not moved into another database table where it is integrated with product data that has been identified as belonging to the category. As such, Yagasaki does not disclose or suggest at least, "parsing said normalized data feed into categorized data elements to determine when a category exists in a product table which corresponds to a categorized data element, wherein said categorized data element is added to a buffer table when said category does not exist and said categorized data element is integrated with stored product data within said product table when said category exists to create integrated data," as recited by amended independent claim 1.

Musgrove discloses a method for storing product information from a plurality of merchants within a centralized shopping server, providing product information from multiple merchants to users, and consummating order transactions relating to one or more user selected products. Musgrove further discloses known methods for collecting product information from merchant servers which use automated web crawlers and bots. Web crawlers and bots are known to those of ordinary skill and are disclosed by Musgrove to enable the invention by providing a means for collecting product information from merchant web sites. Musgrove is limited to searching and displaying product data obtained from a plurality of merchant web sites and facilitating purchase transactions.

While Musgrove generally discloses that product data which is centrally stored should be updated periodically, Musgrove does not disclose a specific system and method for performing the steps necessary to integrate various product data elements (i.e., product descriptions, pricing, delivery dates, etc.) into the central product database. For example, Musgrove suggests collecting such information using a web crawler or bot; however, Musgrove does not further disclose how the

collected information is parsed, identified, classified and matched with corresponding data residing in the centralized product database.

As such, neither Yagasaki, Musgrove, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least "parsing said normalized data feed into categorized data elements to determine when a category exists in a product table which corresponds to a categorized data element, wherein said categorized data element is added to a buffer table when said category does not exist and said categorized data element is integrated with stored product data within said product table when said category exists to create integrated data," as recited by amended independent claim 1.

Claims 3-4, 6-13, and 16-17 variously depend from independent claim 1. Applicants assert that dependent claims 3-4, 6-13, and 16-17 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 26, 2006

By: _____
Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com